ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.
ED002098	N.A.	N.A.

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S): Meek, Sylvia

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Philadelphia Works for Integration

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: Integrated Education, Issue 8

7. EDITOR(S): Weinberg, Meyer

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Urban League of
ST. Philadelphia
CITY, STATE Philadelphia, Pa.
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE Integrated Education Associates, 343 S. Dearborn Street Chicago, Illinois 60604

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
II	30-34	Apr-May 64	5

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES ☒ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: Historical Sketch

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

civic rights	school desegregation	public opinion	
school board policy	school-community relations	school integration	
de facto segregation	citywide commissions	historical developments	
	community support		

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

It is suggested that Philadelphia has now entered the second phase of the integration movement. Now that the school board and a responsible segment of the community are for integration, the act of integration is of paramount importance. A brief history of the civil rights movement in Philadelphia is outlined. One part of the movement dealt with the broad issues of public education, e.g., the method of school board selection and taxing power. The other part dealt with the so-called narrow issues, e.g., segregation and discrimination. Through the efforts of the NAACP, CORE, and interested citizens, demands for integration and equal opportunity in the public schools brought about the establishment of a commission on integration. Eventually the commission helped to encourage greater public awareness and support for integration, and to involve more community groups in the issue.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OR PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED002098

PHILADELPHIA WORKS FOR INTEGRATION

Sylvia Meek

The author, secretary-treasurer of the Philadelphia Coordinating Council on School Integration, heads the Education and Guidance section of the Urban League of Philadelphia.

The story of the Coordinating Council on School Integration in Philadelphia cannot help but be a chronicle of events since the Council and its affiliates have been so caught up in the events. The important moral of the story is the need for coordinated effort in each community.

The activities and the issues around school integration are strikingly similar throughout the nation. There are, however, local peculiarities. In order to fully appreciate the situation in Philadelphia, the reader should be acquainted with some background about our school system.

Until Spring, 1963, the power to levy taxes for Philadelphia schools was in the hands of our state legislature. In 1911 this power had been transferred from the city to the state because of scandals which had exposed political control over the schools. Our school board is an anomalous creature of the state. Its fifteen members are appointed by judges of the Courts of Common Pleas of Philadelphia (who are appointed by the Governor) for six-year terms which have been automatically renewed. Therefore, vacancies on the board have been created due to death or retirement. The board has been an autonomous entity, aloof and remote as far as citizens could perceive, and responsible to no definable body that citizens could reach. Its very structure has precluded citizen participation and involvement and has limited even the most forward-looking of its members. In addition, the system, until Fall, 1962, operated under an unusual set-up of dual administrative control. Theoretically, both the secretary-business manager and the superintendent of instruction had equal administrative status and responsibility. It was no secret, however, that the business manager, who represented extreme conservatism, was the boss. For the community-at-large to "fight city hall" was, indeed, a more promising prospect than the possibility of affecting needed reform in the school system.

However, the forces of discontent were being set in motion. And, as we are seeing throughout the country, the mighty combination of forces generated by automation, international competition, and civil rights can breech even the most impenetrable fortress.

Two movements, as such, germinated during 1961. One went in the direc-

tion of the "broad issues" of public education — method of school board selection, taxing power, etc. The other went in the direction of the so-called narrow issues — discrimination and segregation.

The dynamic leadership provided by our revitalized Citizens Committee on Public Education made educational concerns noteworthy and lent impetus to the mushrooming growth of citizen interest. A study of the school system undertaken by the prestigious, conservative Greater Philadelphia Movement gave sustenance to the broad issues. Integration, however, was not included in this broad picture.

At the same time, several neighborhood groups were becoming increasingly concerned about school segregation. Floyd Logan, that indefatigable pioneer, was continuing his effort begun in the 1930's to eradicate discriminatory practices against Negro teachers. The Philadelphia Chapter of the American Jewish Committee embarked upon a study of equal educational opportunities in the Philadephia schools. Of greatest import was NAACP's court suit against the school system, filed in June, 1961. But, as yet, the integration issue had not fully "jelled."

In June, 1962, CORE intuitively struck the right note at the right moment. Members of the Philadelphia Chapter decided to meet the challenge of a meeting held with the superintendent of schools who had claimed that groups with similar goals had made "conflicting and confusing requests" of him. CORE immediately initiated a meeting of organizations mutually concerned about segregation in the schools for the purpose of exchanging ideas and information. This first meeting, attended by thirteen organizational representatives was sparked with questions, articulation of mutual concerns, and a high degree of interest. Informal meetings continued on an unofficial basis.

Events, fortunately, catapulted our organizations into action almost immediately.

By the opening of the 1962-63 school year, the school board had placed full administrative responsibility in the hands of the superintendent due to the death of the secretary-business manager. (This has not yet been legally rectified through a change in the School Code. But for all intents and purposes "dual-control" is a thing of the past.) A historic precedent was set by the issuance of a fairly detailed budget and the announcement that public hearings would be held on the capital and operating budgets over a period of several weeks.

During the informal meetings of the groups involved, we thought through the relationship of the school budget to the issues which concerned us. In our nascent period of coordination on integration, the two movements previously alluded to — the "broad" and the "narrow" — were being brought together by the school budget. We reached consensus on the need to stress several points in our budget-hearing presentations. Within the context of individual organizational orientation and programs, many of the groups stressed: Support for specific allocations, citizen participation in the budgetary process, a comprehensive survey, the need to arouse greater public support for the financial needs of the schools, the need for a school board policy on integration, and the need to implement such policy through the establishment of a Commission on Integration.

Weeks were spent in fact-finding and research. Carefully thought-out presentations were made at the public hearings which had tremendous impact on the public. A veritable barrage of the "facts of segregation" were leveled at the board and at the community. The Urban League, for example, analyzed the extent of segregation and offered the first specific recommendations for a beginning desegregation program in the schools. Several neighboring groups presented the specifics of segregation and overcrowding in their locales and offered recommendations. Our "informal body" was directly responsible for the appearance of at least sixteen organizations at the hearings and, indirectly, propelled

several other groups into motion. As a result of the public testimony, it was impossible for integration to remain merely parlor-talk. It was now an issue to be reckoned with.

By the time our informal group emerged as the official Coordinating Council on School Integration in March, 1963, significant changes and developments had taken place. The board had already announced its intentions of hiring consultants to conduct surveys of both its business and instructional administrations. The state legislature had failed to empower the school board to receive adequate monies and the financial needs were of paramount concern. Community support for fiscal home rule grew by leaps and bounds. (The board itself was not in favor of a change to City Council. The change has been made.) A special board committee was appointed to review the board's policy on non-discrimination. This special committee was not the Commission on Integration most of us had hoped for, but was, at the time, viewed as a "step in the right direction."

During the next few months the Coordinating Council played an increasingly important leadership role in sharpening the issues and in the involvement of more organizations in the school integration movement. It helped to create a climate of concern for integration before the full impact of the social revolution was felt in Philadelphia. The Council and its affiliates mobilized local neighborhood groups into participation on the district level during meetings and hearings initiated by the Special Board Committee. (Philadelphia's school system is administratively divided into eight school districts.) Many of our neighborhood-based affiliates participated on this level. On a city-wide level, again we were directly responsible for stimulating organizations to testify at public hearings. Our city agency, the Commission on Human Relations, testified for the first time.

From March through September, 1963, the energies of the Council and the individual affiliates were directed towards obtaining a board policy on school integration and the filing of a plan with the court to implement such policy. As the concern for school integration grew, the court suit became of greater significance. We were also articulating our concern both to state legislators and City Council on the need for adequate school financing of an integration program. There was a whirlwind of activity in Philadelphia during this period. The issue of discrimination in administrative positions was brought sharply to the public's attention. The Council did not take a position on this issue, but many of its affiliates did. Council meetings were fraught with the heated issues of compensatory education, teachers' rights, and the discriminatory teacher placement practices. Meetings of the Board of Public Education reflected the tenor of the community. Board meetings were no longer routine, fifteen-minute sessions, observed by a handful of citizens. They became stormy sessions where healthy "rifts" in the board were aired publicly.

Chairs had to be set up on a number of occasions to accommodate several hundred people. The board had to publicly respond to civic groups, Negro ministers, NAACP, Floyd Logan of the Educational Equality League, and the teachers' organizations. The Board of Public Education was truly becoming the province of the public.

The school board did adopt a policy on staff and pupil integration in June, 1963, at the request of citizens involved in its Special Committee on Non-Discrimination. (There is a rather tricky technicality here that should be understood. The Special Committee is a board committee. Citizens do not serve on the committee itself, but on several sub-committees, in an advisory capacity.) There is no doubt that the NAACP court suit and the entry of the 400 Negro pastors (famous for their selective-patronage campaigns) into the educational area strengthened this request. And, after agonizing and even frustrating efforts by many organizations and the Council, the school board finally filed a preliminary integration plan with the Federal Court in September,

1963. [See *Integrated Education*, December, 1963, pp. 7-9.]

September, 1963, ended the first phase in the school integration movement. The Council, unquestionably, had met the full challenge of this period. It successfully helped to bring about public awareness and support for integration. It successfully brought about the involvement of community groups around the issue. The Council had grown from the "informal" meeting of thirteen groups to an "official" structure with twenty-six affiliates and ten decided "friends"—organizations which regularly sent observers. Fourteen of the affiliates are neighborhood-based groups. Although the Council has acted in its own name on very few occasions, its strength has been in the following areas:

1. It is a clearing-house for information and ideas. This was very much needed during the initial period of growth, and will continue to be important.

2. It provides an arena for frank discussion and debate. Our meetings are often heated and stormy. It has been my observation that our most torrid meetings bring about our most successful joint endeavors. Bringing conflicting attitudes to the surface has helped to pull divergent viewpoints into more meaningful consensus.

3. We have brought together neighborhood-based, "grass-roots" organizations and professional staffed city-wide agencies. For both professionals and lay people the experience has been invaluable.

4. The Council has served as a liaison with the most potent forces in the Negro protest movement. (Neither the 400 Negro pastors nor NAACP are affiliated with the Council.)

5. It has become a vehicle through which various segments of the population can be reached. Affiliates are providing increasing leadership on the neighborhood level when dissident and resistant voices are raised. We have successfully initiated meetings with school board members, our two teachers' organizations, and the Negro ministers in an attempt to open lines of communication.

6. The Council has acted as a catalyst for movement. Being "in the know" has propelled many groups into action on various levels.

7. The Council has helped to bring about maturity and depth in understanding the school integration issue. There has been a growing awareness that integration cannot be tacked-on like some caudal appendage to any of the educational concerns—that it is not separate and apart from the broad issues. On the other hand, there has been increased recognition that desegregation cannot wait until all of the necessary changes in public education are made.

We have entered the second phase of the integration movement. Now that the school board and a responsible segment of the community are "for" integration, the *act* of integrating is of paramount importance. As one of my colleagues has said, in Philadelphia, today, to be for integration is like being against sin. Therefore, the Council cannot afford to allow a rift to develop between the action-directed groups entrenched in the Negro community and the more "cautious" city-wide, professional agencies. It must bring these two groupings together into a positive force in support of a forthright and comprehensive integration program.

The "how" and the "when" of desegregation are being contested and vigorously debated across the city. As resistance to desegregation is being organized, the Council must not allow its own debates to end up in a stalemate. In Philadelphia, as elsewhere, the thrust for school desegregation and concomitant educational improvements are being led by NAACP, CORE, the Negro ministers, Urban League, and new leadership emerging from the Negro community. The Coordinating Council can play a vital role in bringing about the understanding and support of this thrust by welding to it the organizations of "good will' which have tradi-

tionally been involved in civil rights efforts and civic progress.

There is now a "wait and see" attitude on the part of many organizations in Philadelphia. The board was scheduled to submit a progress report to the Federal Judge in March, 1964. The subcommittees of the Special Board Committee are to submit reports to the full board by June, 1964. In the meantime, there are rumblings of discontent in the Negro community. There is justifiable suspicion and distrust of committees and reports. The resignation of four citizens (including the writer) from one of the advisory sub-committees and little indication of substantial progress being made in other sub-committees do not bode well for the possibility of a clearly-defined, forthright integration program by June, 1964. It is our hope that the Council will effectively meet the challenge of this phase of the integration movement. If it does, and there are indications that it may, our story will, indeed, become unique.

ED002099

A DECADE OF NEW YORK CHANGES

New York Urban League

All material is taken from A Study of the Problems of Integration in New York City Public Schools Since 1955 *(New York: Urban League of Greater New York, December, 1963).*

This study is intended to review the problems and progress of what has happened on the integration scene in the New York City school system since 1955. That year the study titled *The Status of Negro and Puerto Rican Children and Youth in the Public Schools,* published by the Public Education Association, appeared. To date, no similar report has been released.

We have compared two types of schools in New York City described below:

1. Group "Y" schools on the elementary level composed 90% or more continental white students and on the junior high level, composed of 85% or more continental white students.

2. Group "X" schools on the elementary level composed of 90% or more Negro and Puerto Rican students and on the junior high level